



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/879,170

06/13/2001

Eun Cheol Lee

YHK-0066

3664

34610

7590

05/03/2004

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP
P.O. BOX 221200
CHANTILLY, VA 20153

EXAMINER

WU, XIAO MIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2674

11

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/879,170

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

XIAO M. WU

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 14 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-9, 11-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/1/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-3, 6, 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ryu et al. (US Patent No. 6,504,519).

The applied reference has a common **inventor (Eun Cheol Lee)** with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention “by another,” or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

As to claim 1, Ryu discloses a plasma display panel (Fig. 7), comprising: an address electrode (X1 ...Xn) included in each discharge cell making a unit pixel (51) of the plasma display panel; a plurality of second sustain electrodes (P1, Q1, Fig. 7; or 100P, 100Q, Fig. 6) positioned at each periphery of the discharge cell (51) in a direction crossing the address electrode (X1 ...Xn) to receive a second sustaining pulse (SUSPp, SUSPq, Fig. 8); and at least one of the first sustain electrodes (C1, Fig. 7; or 100C, Fig. 6) positioned at the center of the discharge cell col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line2) in a direction crossing the address electrode (X1

Art Unit: 2674

...Xn) to receive a first sustaining pulse (SUSPc, Fig. 8) applied alternatively with respect to the second sustain electrodes (see Fig. 8).

As to claim 2, Ryu discloses that the first sustain electrodes (100C1, Fig. 6) are provided between the second sustain electrodes (100P1, 100Q1, Fig. 6).

As to claim 3, Ryu discloses a bus electrode (107, Fig. 7) arranged in parallel to the first sustain electrode (100C, Fig. 7) at the center of the first sustain electrode (100C, Fig. 7).

As to claim 6, Ryu discloses a first barrier rib (3, Fig. 2) formed in parallel to the address electrode (4, Fig. 3)

As to claim 9, Ryu discloses a scan/sustain driver (42, Fig. 7) connected to the first sustain electrode (C1 ... Cm, Fig. 7) to apply the scanning pulse (-SCP1 ... -SCPM, Fig. 8) and the first sustaining pulse (SUSPc, Fig. 8); and a common sustaining driver (44, Fig. 7) connected to the second sustain electrode (P1 ... Pm, Q1 ... Qm, Fig. 7) to apply the second sustaining pulse (SUSPp, SUSPq, Fig. 8).

As to claim 13, note the discussion of claim 1 above, Ryu further discloses applying a reset pulse (RPP, Fig. 8) to the second sustain electrode (P1 ... Pm, Fig. 8) and applying a data pulse (WP, Fig. 8) synchronized with the scanning pulse (-SCP1 ... SCPm, Fig. 8) to the scanning electrode (C1 ... Cm, Fig. 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2674

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 7, 8, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Ryu et al. (US Patent No. 6,504,519) in view of Kim (US Patent No. 6,380,678).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the

Art Unit: 2674

claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

As to claims 7 and 8, it is noted that Ryu does not disclose a second barrier rib formed in a direction crossing the first barrier rib and the second barrier rib is provided at an interface of the discharge cells. Kim is cited to teach a plasma display device comprises first and second barrier ribs (121, 122, Fig. 3) providing at an interface of the discharge cells (see Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Ryu with the features of the two barrier ribs as taught by Kim so that the discharge occurs within each of discharge area formed by the first and second barrier ribs.

As to claims 11, Ryu further disclose a dielectric layer (8, Fig. 2) formed in a manner to cover the first and second sustain electrodes. It is noted that Ryu fails to disclose at least two floating electrodes formed in a parallel to the first and second sustain electrode at the rear side of the dielectric layer. Kim is cited to teach a plasma display device comprises two floating electrodes (130, 130', Fig. 4) formed in parallel to the first and second sustain electrodes (211, Fig. 4) at the rear side of the dielectric layer (212, Fig. 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Ryu with the features of the floating electrodes as taught by Kim because the wall charge can be generated on the sides of the isolation wall in which the floating electrodes are formed (col. 4, lines 38-53).

As to claim 12, Kim further discloses the floating electrodes (130, Fig. 4) are provided under the second sustain electrode (211, Fig. 4).

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Ryu et al. (US Patent No. 6,504,519) in view of Marcotte (US Patent No. 6,118,214).

The applied reference has a common inventor (Eun Cheol Lee) with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

As to claim 4, it is noted that Ryu does not disclose bus electrodes arranged in parallel to the first sustain electrode at each edge of the first sustain electrode. Marcotte is to teach a plasma display device comprises bus electrodes arranged in parallel to the sustain electrode. For example, as shown in 4, Marcotte discloses border electrodes 64 which are arranged in parallel to the sustain electrode 56. it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have

Art Unit: 2674

modified Ryu with the features of the bus electrode as taught by Marcotte because the border electrodes can provide a uniform boundary for the discharge gap and ensure a uniform discharge voltage between adjacent electrode structures (col. 3, lines 33-37).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claim 14 is allowed.
8. Claims 5 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 7/23/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the 102(e) rejection, applicant argues that the present application claims priority to the Ruy patent and asserts that the delay for the claim for priority was unintentional delayed, and as such, Ryu is not prior art and therefore, the rejection is moot. This argument is not persuasive because applicant only claims the present application is a continuation-in-part application of US Patent 6,504,519 (Ruy et al.) and not continuation of application of US Patent 6,504,519 (Ruy et al.). The applied reference has a common inventor (**Eun Cheol Lee**) with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it

Art Unit: 2674

constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131. However, applicant fails to show either 37 CFR 1.132 or 37 CFR 1.131

With respect to the 103 rejection, applicant presents the same argument as mentioned above. This argument is not persuasive because applicant only claims the present application is a continuation-in-part application of US Patent 6,504,519 (Ruy et al.) and not continuation of application of US Patent 6,504,519 (Ruy et al.). The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Art Unit: 2674

See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2). The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has not been overcome because applicant fails to show the requirements above.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Xiao Wu whose telephone number is (703) 305-4721.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on (703) 305-4709.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Application/Control Number: 09/879,170


Page 10

Art Unit: 2674

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377

xw

May 2, 2004


XIAO WU
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2674